

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/585,132	Applicant(s) STEIGER ET AL.	
	Examiner LELA S. WILLIAMS	Art Unit 1789	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LELA S. WILLIAMS. (3) ____.

(2) John Shannon, Esq.. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 13 February 2012.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Issues Discussed ☐ 101 ☐ 112 ☐ 102 ☐ 103 ☐ Others
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: ____.

Identification of prior art discussed: ____.

Substance of Interview
(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

February 7, 2012: Placed call to discuss possible examiner's amendment. Suggested claim language is "A method for the instantisation of powders for use in food stuff and animal feed production wherein the method comprises spraying a mixture of lecithin and alginate in a solution of water or an aqueous liquid onto powdered particles which comprise free surface fat, and subsequently drying said sprayed powdered particles." Mr. Shannon suggested removing "a solution of". Mr. Shannon will contact applicant for approval.

February 9, 2012. Applicant agreed to proposed claim amendments as per the February 7, 2012 conversation with Mr. Shannon. Mr. Shannon confirmed the agreed amendments by emailing a copy of the new claim language for the Examiner's Amendment. However, there were additional words, i.e. typo's, in claim 2 which were not agreed upon. Call was placed to Mr. Shannon and message left.

February 13, 2012: Mr. Shannon confirmed that the additional words in claim 2 ("harming a an") in the email copy of the claims were typo's and should not be in the claim. The original claim language was agreed upon

Applicant recodation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recodation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☒ Attachment

/LELA S WILLIAMS/ Examiner, Art Unit 1789	/Kelly Bekker/ Primary Examiner
--	------------------------------------